

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA**

RECEIVED

DEC 30 2015

Calvin Hammock
5106 Brown Street
Davenport, Iowa 52806

**CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA**

**Plaintiff/ Petitioner
Pro Se**

Case No. 3:15-cv-00111-JAJ-CFB

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES
REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS RESISTANCE BRIEF**

vs

NASA HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT
OF DEFENSE, SPACE EXPLORATION
TECHNOLOGIES SPACE X, APPLE,
BLACKBERRY, CURVE CORP. VIRGIN
MOBILE, MEDIACOM MCC IOWA LLC,
AMERICAN WATER IOWA , ANY YET UN-
IDENTIFIED ENTITIES , PERSONS,
SATELLITES, GOVT AGENCIES, GOVT.
TECHNOLOGIES, INTERAGENCIES, FUSION
CENTER PARTICIPANT PARTNERS
CORPORATIONS, COMPANIES, SOFTWARE USED
BY AND WITH STATE ACTORS & TEMPORARY
STATE ACTORS **DEFENDANTS**

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES
REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS RESISTANCE BRIEF**

NOW COMES Plaintiff in response to Space X reply to Plaintiffs resistance brief.

ARGUMENT

On December 3, 2015 Document 6 in this current case, District Court Judge ORDERED that because Plaintiff did not follow Local Rule plaintiffs filing was 'stricken'.

Defendant SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES counsel is a legal professional and did not comply with local rule 5.2 at:

I. Technical Failures

1. Jurisdictional Filing Deadline. Some deadlines in the Federal Rules of Civil, Criminal , and Appellate Procedure are jurisdictional and cannot be extended. (*See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P 6 (b)(2).) It is the filer's

responsibility to ensure, by whatever means necessary, that a document is filed timely to comply with jurisdictional deadlines. A technical failure, including a failure of the ECF system, will not excuse the filer from compliance with a jurisdictional deadline.

The effect of not complying with deadlines that are reinforced by local jurisdictional rules as stated in Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 8 (6) are:

EFFECT OF FAILING TO DENY “An allegation other than one relating to the amount of damages is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied. If a responsive pleading is not required, an allegation is considered denied or avoided.”

Plaintiff did not respond to SPACE EXPLORATIONS argument in its Motion to Dismiss as it was time barred. Space Explorations counsel is a legal professional and cannot circumvent the rules of the court, particularly to issues of jurisdictional deadlines which cannot be extended. Defendant Space Exploration’s Counsel claims to have been befuddled as to try and circumvent the Plaintiffs MOTION FOR DEFAULT against SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES. To hold Plaintiff who is not a legal professional to a higher standard than professional counsel would be

unethical, unprofessional and would violate local jurisdictional rules as well as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE Plaintiff so moves this court to **STRIKE** defendants SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES Motion to Dismiss and SPACE EXPLORATION TECHNOLOGIES Reply to Plaintiffs RESISTANCE To Space Exploration Technologies Motion to Dismiss.

December 29, 2015

Calvin Hammock

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am placing in the U.S. Mail by certified mail a copy of this response to ALL defendants and or Attorneys on December 29, 2015.

Calvin Hammock

Subscribed and sworn on December 29, 2015

Notary

Amy M. Emery

